

## On the Absence of Chiral Fermions in Interacting Lattice Theories

*by*

Yigal Shamir

Department of Physics

Weizmann Institute of Science, Rehovot 76100, ISRAEL

email: ftshamir@weizmann.weizmann.ac.il

### ABSTRACT

We consider interacting theories with a compact internal symmetry group on a regular lattice. We show that the spectrum is necessarily vector-like provided the following conditions are satisfied: (a) weak form of locality, (b) relativistic continuum limit without massless bosons, and (c) pole-free effective vertex functions for conserved currents.

The proof exploits the zero frequency inverse retarded propagator of an appropriate set of interpolating fields as an effective quadratic hamiltonian, to which the Nielsen-Ninomiya theorem is applied.

## 1. Introduction and Conclusions

The only rigorous way, presently known to us, to define non-abelian gauge theories, relies on the lattice as a regulator. The observed fermion spectrum fits into a chiral representation of  $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ , and so the construction of a consistent chiral gauge theory on the lattice has been a major goal in theoretical physics.

In spite of extensive efforts, this program has been unsuccessful to date. The basic stumbling block is the doubling problem [1,2]. A naive discretization of the continuum hamiltonian of a Weyl fermion gives rise to eight Weyl fermions in the classical continuum limit of the lattice hamiltonian. If one starts with a Dirac fermion, the doublers can be eliminated by introducing the Wilson term. But the price is that the axial symmetry of the classical continuum hamiltonian is lost.

There is an intimate relation between species doubling on the lattice and chiral anomalies in the continuum. Although classically conserved for a massless Dirac fermion, the conservation of the axial current is violated by quantum effects in the continuum theory. On the other hand, the lattice is a physical regulator, and so any current which is conserved at tree level should be conserved in the continuum limit as well. If one insists on keeping the axial symmetry of the lattice action, the conflict between the predictions of the lattice theory and the continuum theory is resolved by the appearance of the doublers. The obvious price is that now, the continuum limit of the lattice theory is different from the continuum theory from which we have started.

Following the work of Karsten and Smit [3], the precise conditions for fermion doubling in a free fermionic theory defined on a regular lattice were stated by Nielsen and Ninomiya as a no-go theorem [4]. They assume the existence of a set of exactly conserved, locally defined charges which admit discrete eigenvalues. The Nielsen-Ninomiya (NN) theorem then asserts that there must be an equal number of positive helicity and negative helicity fermions in every complex representation of the symmetry group, provided the Fourier transform of the free hamiltonian has a continuous first derivative. (Recall that chirality equal helicity for massless fermions). The NN theorem applies in particular when the hamiltonian has a short range, and the charges are constructed canonically and generate a compact Lie group.

The absence of chiral fermions is essentially a counting theorem about the zeros of the free hamiltonian in the Brillouin zone. It takes its simplest form in one space dimension. A right (left) mover is an eigenvalue of  $H(p)$  which satisfies

$$E(p) = \pm(p - p_c) + O((p - p_c)^2), \quad (1)$$

in the neighbourhood of some  $p_c$ . The presence of an equal number of plus and minus

signs is then nothing but the familiar property that the graph of a function from the circle into the real numbers which has a continuous derivative and regular zeros must cross the axis upwards and downwards an equal number of times.

In three space dimensions, a massless fermion corresponds to level crossing which is described by the effective two-by-two hamiltonian

$$H_{eff}(\mathbf{p}) = \pm \boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot (\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{p}_c) + O((\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{p}_c)^2). \quad (2)$$

The point  $\mathbf{p}_c$  is called a *degeneracy point*. The  $\pm$  signs correspond to the helicity of the fermion. The physically more transparent proof of the NN theorem (second paper of ref. [4]) relies on the examination of trajectories of constant  $\sigma_3$  in the energy surface, which go through at least one degeneracy point. Since the Brillouin zone is topologically a three-torus, these curves must be closed. When the curve goes through a degeneracy point, it crosses from positive to negative  $E$  (or vice versa). Moreover, one can choose an orientation to the curve using the local properties of the wave function, and show that near a degeneracy point the orientation (thought of as a unit tangent vector) coincides with the helicity of the fermion. The fact that every differentiable curve is orientable then implies that every crossing which corresponds to a left handed particle must be followed by a crossing through another degeneracy point which describes a right handed particle.

The continuum limit of asymptotically free gauge theories is achieved at vanishing bare coupling. Together with the success of perturbative QCD in deep inelastic scattering, this leads to the generally accepted view that the fermionic spectrum can be correctly determined by setting the gauge couplings to zero. In the absence of other interactions, the NN theorem implies that the fermionic spectrum must be vector-like provided the hamiltonian has a short range.

Attempts to avoid fermion doubling by using long range lattice derivatives lead to various inconsistencies at the level of weak coupling perturbation theory. Important examples include the SLAC derivative [5] which avoids the extra zeros by creating a discontinuity in the dispersion relation, and a method due to Rebbi [6] which is characterized by the presence of a pole in the dispersion relation. The former suffers from Lorentz violations and non-locality [7] while the latter suffers from the presence of ghosts [8].

As it stands, the NN theorem does not apply if the lattice model contains some strong interactions. This observation have led to several proposals [9] for constructing chiral gauge theories on the lattice which exploit a common strategy. (See ref. [10] for a review). One starts with a model containing only fermions and (possibly) scalar fields. In addition to standard quadratic terms, one introduces judiciously chosen

strong interactions among these fields which are operative at the lattice scale, and vanish in the classical continuum limit. Local symmetries of the desired continuum theory – the target theory – should appear at this stage as exact global symmetries of the model.

The strong interactions introduced at the lattice scale do not survive in the continuum limit. The continuum limit of the fermion-scalar model is a *free* theory of massless fermions. The hope is, that if the phase diagram is sufficiently non-trivial, arguments based on weak coupling perturbation theory will not apply, and a point in the phase diagram will be found in which all the doublers have been decoupled and the massless spectrum is chiral. It is crucial that, at the same time, the to-be-gauged global symmetries are not broken spontaneously.

If this program were successful, a consistent chiral gauge theory could be obtained by turning on the gauge interactions in such a model. However, explicit model calculations have led to negative conclusions in all cases studied so far [10,11].

Our purpose in the present paper is to provide a general treatment of the problem, which applies for example also to similar models based on the recently proposed domain wall fermions [12]. We will consider a hamiltonian defined on a regular lattice that has a compact global symmetry group which is not spontaneously broken. We will prove that under mild assumptions, which are directly related to the physical properties of a consistent continuum limit, the spectrum is necessarily vector-like. A summary of our main results is contained in ref. [13]

Our proof is based on the observation that, while in general the physics of an interacting theory may be very complicated, all the crucial ingredients of the NN theorem have natural generalizations to this case. The object which plays the role of an effective hamiltonian is the *zero frequency inverse propagator*. Analyticity, or more generally, differentiability properties of the propagator are related to the range of the hamiltonian and hence to the *locality* of the theory. This relation can be exhibited most directly if we choose to work with the *retarded propagator*. Moreover, the desired properties of the continuum limit imply that massless fermions can still be identified with the zeros of the effective hamiltonian, and that these zeros still take the form of eq. (2). Finally, needless to say, periodicity across the Brillouin zone is mandatory in the interacting theory as well.

We first present a heuristic argument that shows how, using the above ingredients, one can conclude that the spectrum must be vector-like in interacting theories too. For methodological reasons, we will base this argument on the more familiar self energy, i.e. the inverse of the time ordered propagator. We comment that, anyhow, at zero frequency all propagators coincide because the pole prescription is irrelevant.

For definiteness, consider a hamiltonian defined on a cubic lattice whose spectrum contains in particular a left handed fermion in the vicinity of the origin of the Brillouin zone. Suppose that this chiral fermion appears as a pole in the two point function of an interpolating two-component field  $\psi$ . It makes no difference whether the interpolating field is elementary or composite.

Consider now the self-energy of the interpolating field  $S^{-1}(\omega, \mathbf{p})$ . According to our assumption, for small  $\omega$  and  $\mathbf{p}$ ,  $S^{-1}(\omega, \mathbf{p}) \approx \omega - \boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{p}$  up to higher order terms. The question is whether  $S^{-1}(\omega, \mathbf{p})$  can have no other zeros in the Brillouin zone. Let us consider the function  $\omega_0(\mathbf{p})$  defined implicitly by  $\det S^{-1}(\omega_0(\mathbf{p}), \mathbf{p}) = 0$ . (There are in fact two independent functions which satisfy this condition because  $S^{-1}$  is a two by two matrix). Notice that in general  $\omega_0(\mathbf{p})$  will be complex for real values of  $\mathbf{p}$ , because in an interacting theory the self-energy has an imaginary part.

Suppose that, For small  $p$  in the  $z$  direction,  $\omega_0(0, 0, p_3) \approx p_3$ . By the periodicity of the Brillouin zone,  $\text{Re } \omega_0(\mathbf{p})$  and  $\text{Im } \omega_0(\mathbf{p})$  should each have another zero as  $p_3$  goes from zero to  $2\pi/a$ . It now appears that we may be able to avoid an extra zero of  $\omega_0(\mathbf{p})$  by going into the complex plane. Namely, by arranging that  $\text{Im } \omega_0(\mathbf{p}) \neq 0$  at the point where  $\text{Re } \omega_0(\mathbf{p}) = 0$ . This, however, is impossible!  $\text{Re } \omega_0(\mathbf{p})$  is the energy of the excitation, and an excitation with vanishing energy cannot have a finite width because of phase space arguments. Conversely, a finite width would imply that the vacuum is unstable!

The above argument indicates that, as long as correlation functions have ordinary analytical properties, the only new possibility offered by an interacting theory is that of spontaneous symmetry breaking. In the present context, the scale set by the expectation value of the would-be Higgs field tends to be comparable to the inverse lattice spacing. We can try to fine tune the higgs VEV to a physical scale, but then the doublers will not decouple because their masses are proportional to the higgs VEV. For a detailed discussion of this issue see ref. [14].

If we forbid spontaneous symmetry breaking, we can conclude from the above argument that a doubler must be present. The purpose of the no-go theorem derived below is to cast this consideration in a rigorous form.

We first need some definitions. Given an appropriate set of interpolating fields, we introduce the *retarded anti-commutator*

$$R_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{x}, t) = i\theta(t) \langle 0 | \{ \psi_\alpha(\mathbf{x}, t), \psi_\beta^\dagger(\mathbf{0}, 0) \} | 0 \rangle, \quad (3)$$

where possible colour and flavour indices have been suppressed. We also introduce the space and space-time Fourier transforms

$$\hat{R}_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{p}, t) = \sum_{\mathbf{x}} e^{-i\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{x}} R_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{x}, t), \quad (4)$$

$$\tilde{R}_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{p}, \omega) = \int_0^\infty dt e^{i\omega t} \hat{R}_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{p}, t), \quad (5)$$

and define

$$\mathcal{R}_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{p}) = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \tilde{R}_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{p}, \omega = i\epsilon). \quad (6)$$

On the lattice one cannot demand that (anti)-commutators of local operators should vanish identically outside the light cone. We begin in sect. 2 with a discussion of locality properties, which are classified according to the rate at which  $R_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{x}, t)$  tends to zero at large space-like separations. The main result of this section is that an exponentially bounded anti-commutator gives rise to an *analytic*  $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p})$ . The only singularities occur at *generalized degeneracy points*, which are those points in the Brillouin zone where the hamiltonian admits eigenstates of vanishing energy. The proof invokes the “edge of the wedge” theorem [15,16], and it is an adaptation to the lattice context of classic results from the theory of dispersion relations.

In view of the intimate relation between causality and analyticity in the continuum, an exponentially bounded anti-commutator on the lattice should be a necessary condition for causality in the continuum limit. We comment, however, that in order to apply the NN theorem all that is needed is that the effective hamiltonian  $\mathcal{R}^{-1}(\mathbf{p})$  have a continuous first derivative. Consequently, it is sufficient to assume a much weaker form of locality, namely, that  $R_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{x}, t)$  is bounded by an appropriate inverse power of  $\mathbf{x}$ . This general case will be discussed in sect. 4. Two examples of anti-commutators in free lattice theories are worked out in appendix A.

In sect. 3 we characterize the possible singularities of  $\mathcal{R}^{-1}(\mathbf{p})$ . In view of the desired properties of the continuum limit (before the gauge interactions are turned on) we may assume that at sufficiently large distances physics is correctly described by an effective lagrangian of massless fermions interaction only via non-renormalizable couplings. Demanding that all singularities of  $\mathcal{R}^{-1}(\mathbf{p})$  should be compatible with those allowed by the effective lagrangian, we show that  $\mathcal{R}^{-1}(\mathbf{p})$  has regular zeros of the form of eq. (2) which are in one-to-one correspondence with massless fermions. Moreover,  $\mathcal{R}^{-1}(\mathbf{p})$  has a continuous first derivative provided one form of singularity is excluded “by hand”. The NN theorem is then applied to  $\mathcal{R}^{-1}(\mathbf{p})$  and the above advertized conclusions are obtained.

The singularity we do not allow is the presence of a *pole* in  $\mathcal{R}^{-1}(\mathbf{p})$ . We forbid this situation by assuming that the elements of the matrix  $\mathcal{R}_{\alpha\beta}^{-1}(\mathbf{p})$  are bounded. We comment that, together with the assumption that symmetries are not broken spontaneously, this is equivalent via the Ward identities to the requirement that effective vertex functions, defined as correlation functions of conserved currents and the interpolating fields, are pole free.

The presence of a pole in  $\mathcal{R}^{-1}(\mathbf{p})$  may reflect a kinematical singularity, arising from a bad choice of interpolating fields. A kinematical singularity can arise, for example, if one uses two interpolating fields for two fermions in different corners of the Brillouin zone, whereas actually they can both be interpolated by a single field, or if not all fermions are interpolated. In appendix B we explain how one can identify the kinematical nature of the singularity, and describe a “trial and error” method for constructing an *admissible* set of interpolating fields which is free of kinematical singularities.

If a pole in  $\mathcal{R}_{\alpha\beta}^{-1}(\mathbf{p})$  is not an artifact of an inadmissible set of interpolating fields, it cannot arise unless the hamiltonian is highly non-local. In a very general context, it has been shown that such poles give rise to the appearance of ghosts in one loop diagrams once gauge fields are introduced [8]. The reason is that, via the Ward identity, such poles appear in the vertex function, but they contribute to the vacuum polarization with the wrong sign. Interpreted in a hamiltonian language, this result implies that the action of a local current on the vacuum takes one outside the Hilbert space, which is unacceptable. We thus expect that it should be possible to extend our theorem and to rigorously exclude the presence of such poles in a consistent quantum theory.

Sect. 4 is devoted to a generalization of the theorem to a much larger class of theories. Leaving the other assumptions unchanged, we show that a sufficient condition for fermion doubling is that  $R_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{x}, t)$  be bounded by  $1/|\mathbf{x}|^\gamma$  where the exponent  $\gamma$  is strictly bigger than the dimension of space-time. We believe that this condition is also necessary, but we have not tried to construct explicit models that can verify this conjecture.

In sect. 5 we discuss the implications of our no-go theorem. The theorem is sufficient to rule out the existence of chiral fermions in all fermion-scalar models proposed so far in the literature. As already mentioned, this conclusion is in agreement with explicit model calculations [11].

Even more remarkably, the theorem implies that any attempt to reproduce the standard model on the lattice without violating gauge invariance must fail, if the spectrum can be correctly determined by switching off the Electro-Weak interactions, and the effective vertex functions of the Electro-Weak currents are pole-free in the symmetric phase. There is no need to switch off QCD in order to draw this conclusion! The reason is that the spectrum of QCD does not contain massless bosons, and so, in the absence of the photon, an effective lagrangian of the kind described above is valid at distances larger than one Fermi. We comment that it should be possible to accommodate a massless pion without changing the conclusions because a Goldstone

boson has only derivative couplings.

The fact that gauge invariant lattice theories are necessarily vector-like raises an intriguing question concerning the relation between fermion doubling and the anomaly. If we are careful to work with an anomaly free theory and to break explicitly at the lattice scale all global symmetries which are anomalous in the target continuum theory (e.g. baryon number), then there is no “need” for the appearance of doublers, because the lattice theory does not have a bigger symmetry compared to the target theory [14,17]. This is the case, for example, in the Eichten-Preskill model [9]. Nevertheless, the doublers *do* appear. We conclude this paper with a few comments on possible resolutions of this paradox.

## 2. Locality and Analyticity

We consider a hamiltonian  $\mathcal{H}$  defined on a three dimensional regular lattice. The time variable is continuous, whereas the spacial coordinates take values on a lattice generated by three linearly independent vectors  $\mathbf{v}_{(k)}$ ,  $k = 1, 2, 3$ . We assume discrete translation invariance, i.e. there exist three unitary operators  $\mathcal{T}_{(k)}$ , commuting among themselves as well as with the hamiltonian, which generate finite translations

$$\mathcal{T}_{(k)}\Phi(\mathbf{x}, t)\mathcal{T}_{(k)}^\dagger = \Phi(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{v}_{(k)}, t), \quad (7)$$

where  $\Phi(\mathbf{x}, t)$  is a generic field.

Discrete translation invariance implies the existence of a Brillouin zone  $\mathcal{B}$ . This is the paralleloid spanned by the three vectors  $\mathbf{P}_{(j)}$ , which satisfy  $\mathbf{P}_{(j)} \cdot \mathbf{v}_{(k)} = 2\pi\delta_{jk}$ . Momentum eigenstates are labeled by  $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{B}$ , and all physical quantities must be periodic across the Brillouin zone.

We also assume the existence a set of conserved charges  $Q_a$  which are defined as the sum over all lattice points of a local density. The  $Q$ -s generate the exact global symmetries of the model. We assume that they take discrete eigenvalues or, equivalently, that the global symmetry group is compact. We also assume that the  $Q$ -s annihilate the vacuum, i.e. there is no spontaneous symmetry breaking.

In this paper, we will say that an operator  $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{x}, t)$  is local if it depends only on the Heisenberg fields at time  $t$  and at sites  $\mathbf{x}'$  whose distance from  $\mathbf{x}$  is less than a fixed, finite number. Particularly relevant local operators are polynomials in the canonical fields, but we can in principle allow for a more general class of local operators.

For a free lattice hamiltonian, relativistic invariance in the low energy limit amounts to the requirement that all fermionic eigenstates with vanishing energy compared to the lattice cutoff should be described by effective two-by-two hamiltonians



as in eq. (2). But if an interacting theory has massless particles in its spectrum, it may be difficult (if not impossible) to separate one particle states from, say, three particle states containing the original particle plus a soft fermion-antifermion pair.

On physical grounds, if the particle can be created in a causal process, there should exist a *local interpolating field* which has a finite probability to create the particle by acting on the vacuum. The particle should then generate a singularity in the two point function of the interpolating field.

This consideration suggests the following strategy. We will not attempt to extract the low energy spectrum from the elusive one particle states. Instead, we will assume that at sufficiently large distances, physics is correctly described by an effective lagrangian of massless fermions interaction only via non-renormalizable couplings. We will then demand that all infra-red singularities of the correlation functions of the lattice interpolating fields should be compatible with those allowed by the effective lagrangian.

We will assume that the lattice interpolating fields are local and that they belong to a given complex representation of the global symmetry. We intend to study their retarded propagator defined in eq. (3), and to establish its analytical properties.

We first observe that  $R(\mathbf{x}, t)$  is *bounded*. This is a trivial consequence of translation invariance and of the fact that  $\psi_\alpha(\mathbf{x}, 0)$  is a well defined operator on the Hilbert space. Thus, there exists  $0 < b_1 < \infty$  such that

$$|R_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{x}, t)| \leq \left\| \psi(\mathbf{0}, 0) |0\rangle \right\|^2 + \left\| \psi^\dagger(\mathbf{0}, 0) |0\rangle \right\|^2 \leq b_1. \quad (8)$$

Another important property is that for fixed  $\mathbf{x}$ ,  $R(\mathbf{x}, t)$  is an analytic function of  $t$ . Once more, this is a trivial consequence of the fact that on the lattice all operators are well defined and that  $\psi(\mathbf{x}, t) = \exp(i\mathcal{H}t)\psi(\mathbf{x}, 0)\exp(-i\mathcal{H}t)$ . As a result,  $R(\mathbf{x}, t)$  cannot vanish identically outside the light cone, for then it would be zero everywhere.

We should therefore distinguish between theories with various degree of locality, as characterized by the rate at which  $R(\mathbf{x}, t)$  tends to zero at large space-like separations. We will say that  $R(\mathbf{x}, t)$  is *weakly local of degree*  $\gamma > 0$  if there are positive constants  $c$  and  $b_2$  such that for all  $|\mathbf{x}| > ct$

$$|R_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{x}, t)| \leq \min \left\{ b_1, \frac{b_2}{(|\mathbf{x}| - ct)^\gamma} \right\}. \quad (9a)$$

Notice that this is an inverse power law bound.

We will say that  $R(\mathbf{x}, t)$  is *local* if it can be bounded by an exponential, i.e. if there are positive constants  $c$ ,  $b_2$  and  $\mu$  such that for all  $|\mathbf{x}| > ct$

$$|R_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{x}, t)| \leq \min \left\{ b_1, b_2 e^{-\mu(|\mathbf{x}| - ct)} \right\}. \quad (9b)$$

Finally, we will say that  $R(\mathbf{x}, t)$  is *strongly local* if it decreases faster than an exponential, i.e. if it satisfies a bound of the form (9b) for every  $\mu$ .

In this section we will assume that  $R(\mathbf{x}, t)$  is bounded by an exponential. This will allow us to prove that  $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p})$  is analytic. The more general case will be treated in sect. 4. As suggested by the example of appendix A, it is plausible that short range lattice hamiltonians always give rise to strongly local (anti)-commutators. In any event, as we have already mentioned, an analytic propagator is compatible with causality in the continuum limit. We therefore expect that only theories with exponentially bounded (anti)-commutators can have a consistent continuum limit. It is interesting, though, that fermion doubling can be proved assuming only that  $R(\mathbf{x}, t)$  is weakly local of degree  $\gamma > d$  ( $d$  is the space-time dimension). In this case  $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p})$  will have a continuous first derivative except at generalized degeneracy points. As shown in appendix A, the anti-commutator of SLAC fermions violates this condition, as it must do in order to allow for the discontinuity of the spectrum at  $p = \pi/a$ .

The last thing we need is the notion of a *generalized degeneracy point*. We introducing the *advanced* anti-commutator

$$A(\mathbf{x}, t) = -i\theta(-t) \langle 0 | \{ \psi_\alpha(\mathbf{x}, t), \psi_\beta^\dagger(\mathbf{0}, 0) \} | 0 \rangle, \quad (10)$$

as well as its Fourier transform  $\tilde{A}(\mathbf{p}, \omega)$ . For real values of  $\mathbf{p}$  and  $\omega$ , we define

$$E_0(\mathbf{p}) = \sup \{ \omega \mid \tilde{R}(\mathbf{p}, \omega') = \tilde{A}(\mathbf{p}, \omega') \text{ if } |\omega'| < \omega \}. \quad (11)$$

The physical meaning of this definition is that  $E_0(\mathbf{p})$  is the lowest possible energy for eigenstates with momentum  $\mathbf{p}$ . We define a generalized degeneracy point by the condition  $E_0(\mathbf{p}_c) = 0$ . Thus,  $\mathbf{p}_c$  is a generalized degeneracy point if it is the end point of a gap-less continuous spectrum.

We now establish the basic analytical properties of the retarded propagator.

*Lemma.* Assume that  $R(x, t)$  is local in the sense of eq. (9b). Then (a)  $\tilde{R}(\mathbf{p}, \omega)$  is holomorphic in the domain  $\text{Im } \omega > 0$ ,  $|\text{Im } \mathbf{p}| < \min\{c^{-1}\text{Im } \omega, \mu\}$ ; (b)  $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p})$  is analytic with singularities only at generalized degeneracy points.

*Proof.* By assumption, the r.h.s. of eq. (4) is bounded by the r.h.s. of eq. (9b) times  $e^{|\mathbf{x}||\text{Im } \mathbf{p}|}$ . Hence, the sum in eq. (4) converges absolutely and  $\hat{R}_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{p}, t)$  is holomorphic in the domain  $|\text{Im } \mathbf{p}| < \mu$ . Moreover,  $\hat{R}_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{p}, t)$  can be bounded by a polynomial of third degree in  $t$  times  $e^{ct|\text{Im } \mathbf{p}|}$ . The presence of the damping factor  $e^{-t\text{Im } \omega}$  then implies that the integral on the r.h.s. of eq. (5) converges absolutely for  $|\text{Im } \mathbf{p}| < \min\{c^{-1}\text{Im } \omega, \mu\}$ . This proves (a). Notice that if  $R(x, t)$  is strongly local than  $\hat{R}_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{p}, t)$  is an entire function of  $\mathbf{p}$ . In this case  $\tilde{R}(\mathbf{p}, \omega)$  is holomorphic in the forward cone  $|\text{Im } \mathbf{p}| < c^{-1}\text{Im } \omega$ .

In order to prove (b) we notice that the Fourier transform of the *advanced* anti-commutator has similar properties except that the sign of  $\text{Im}\omega$  is now negative. A straightforward application of the edge of the wedge theorem [15] now implies that the common boundary function  $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p})$  is analytic, with singularities only at generalized degeneracy points. (A modern proof of the theorem can be found for example in ref. [16]). This proves (b).

The analyticity of  $\mathcal{R}_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{p})$  away from generalized degeneracy points, implies that there can be no obstructions to the smooth motion throughout the Brillouin zone from one zero of  $\mathcal{R}_{\alpha\beta}^{-1}(\mathbf{p})$  to another, provided we exclude the possibility of *poles* in  $\mathcal{R}_{\alpha\beta}^{-1}(\mathbf{p})$ . We forbid this situation by assuming that the elements of the matrix  $\mathcal{R}_{\alpha\beta}^{-1}(\mathbf{p})$  are bounded. The justification for this assumption has been discussed in the introduction. As we have explained there, we believe that this is a pathological situation, and that in a more complete treatment it should be possible to exclude it rigorously. Finally, we remind the reader that this assumption implies in particular the absence of kinematical singularities and hence that the set of interpolating fields is admissible. For more details see appendix B.

### 3. A no-go theorem

By definition,  $\mathcal{R}^{-1}(\mathbf{p})$  is a hermitian matrix. In order to show that it qualifies as an effective hamiltonian which satisfies the NN theorem, what is left for us to do is to show that it has a continuous first derivative at generalized degeneracy points and that its zeros can be identified with massless fermions.

We assume that the continuum limit is relativistic and that the only massless particles are fermions. Low energy physics should therefore be described by an effective lagrangian containing massless fermions coupled only via non-renormalizable interactions. The interaction of the smallest possible dimension is a four Fermi coupling. Notice that the masses of other excitations need not diverge as the lattice spacing tends to zero. There may well be massive excitations in the *physical* spectrum. In this case the above effective lagrangian correctly describes physics at distance scales which are sufficiently large compared to the Compton wave length of the least massive particle.

Let us denote by  $\mathbf{p}_{phys}$  the momentum variable which transforms homogeneously under the Lorentz group in the low energy limit. The only form of singularity in the zero frequency fermionic propagator which is compatible with the above effective

lagrangian is

$$\pm \frac{1}{\boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{p}_{phys} \left( 1 + O(\mathbf{p}_{phys}^4 \log \mathbf{p}_{phys}^2) \right)}. \quad (12)$$

We have  $\mathbf{p}_{phys}^4$  in front of the logarithmic term because this term involves at least two powers of coupling constants, and all coupling constants have a negative mass dimension which is at least two.

Clearly, an allowed singularity of  $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p})$  can be obtained by substituting  $\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{p}_c$  instead of  $\mathbf{p}_{phys}$  in eq. (12). We call such a singularity a *primary singularity*. The precise definition is as follows. A generalized degeneracy point  $\mathbf{p}_c$  is a primary singularity if there exists a unitary transformation  $U$  such that

$$\lim_{\mathbf{p} \rightarrow \mathbf{p}_c} [\boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot (\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{p}_c) \otimes I_1] U \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p}) U^{-1} = [I \otimes A]. \quad (13)$$

In eq. (13),  $I$  is the identity matrix in spin space,  $I_1$  is the identity matrix in colour and flavour space, and  $A$  is a diagonal matrix  $A = \text{diag}(Z_1, \dots, Z_k, 0, \dots, 0)$ . The  $Z$ -s are non-zero constants, which are in one-to-one correspondence with massless fermions. The helicity of the massless fermion is determined by the sign of the corresponding  $Z$ . We comment that if one does not insist that the massless fermion will propagate at the speed of light, then one can allow for any non-singular linear transformation instead of  $U$ . But the relativistic case is obviously more restrictive.

We now have to determine whether there are other allowed forms of singularity points. In order to do so we have to digress for a moment and discuss what are the acceptable values of  $\mathbf{p}_c$  for a primary singularity point. We claim that Poincaré invariance in the continuum limit implies that a primary singularity can occur only at a point which is a linear combination with *rational* coefficients of the three vectors  $\mathbf{P}_{(j)}$  which span the Brillouin zone.

Assuming that this property holds and that the number of primary singularity points is finite (i.e. a finite number of massless fermions), there exist three smallest positive integers  $n_{(j)}$  such that all primary singularity points are representatives of the origin of a reduced Brillouin zone  $\mathcal{B}'$  spanned by  $\mathbf{P}_{(j)}/n_{(j)}$ . We can then identify the physical momentum with  $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{B}'$ .

Let us now consider what other forms of singularities are allowed in  $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p})$ . As an example, take a cubic lattice and assume that a primary singularity occurs at  $\mathbf{p}_c = (2\pi/Na, 0, 0)$  for some  $N$ . The presence of a single particle spectrum near  $\mathbf{p}_c$  then implies the existence of multi-particle spectra at the points  $n\mathbf{p}_c$  for  $n = 2, \dots, N$ . The multi-particle thresholds will all be at  $E = 0$  because our particle is massless. This implies that all these points are generalized degeneracy points of the hamiltonian.

In general, the quantum numbers of the multi-particle states may be different from those of the original particle. But since the global symmetry group is compact,

some of these states *will* have the same quantum numbers as the original particle and so they will contribute to  $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p})$  if there are no additional accidental symmetries. We will denote the corresponding points as secondary singularities. The leading contribution of the gap-less spectrum to  $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p})$  at a secondary singularity point can take the form

$$\pm \boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{p}_{phys} \mathbf{p}_{phys}^2 \log \mathbf{p}_{phys}^2. \quad (14)$$

As before,  $\mathbf{p}_{phys} = \mathbf{p} - \mathbf{p}_c$ . This form is dictated by the requirement that, once we sum  $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p})$  over all points that correspond to the same  $\mathbf{p}_{phys}$ , we will obtain an expression compatible with the expansion of the denominator of eq. (12) in powers of the coupling constant. Notice that there is no reason that  $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p})$  should vanish at a secondary singularity point, because it always receives additional, regular contributions from finite energy branches of the spectrum.

In  $\mathbf{x}$ -space, the requirement that all singularity points occur at rational points means that zero energy states are periodic. Eigenstates of definite physical momentum are then obtained by a Fourier sum over sub-lattices which respects that periodicity. Zero energy states are constant on every sub-lattice, and this is the lattice equivalent of the property that a relativistic continuum eigenstate of zero energy must be constant in space.

By contrast, suppose that a primary singularity occurred at a non-rational point. This would imply the the lattice model has a non-periodic zero energy state. Moreover, this primary singularity would lead to an infinite number of secondary singularities that would be dense on a sub-space of the Brillouin zone whose dimension is at least one. Under these circumstances the continuum limit cannot be both translation invariant and Lorentz invariant. It would be impossible to define a conserved momentum which generates translations in space, has a continuous spectrum and which, at the same time, assigns the eigenvalue zero to all zero energy states.

In fact, under these circumstances, insisting that a “momentum” operator assign the eigenvalue zero to all zero energy states would entail the appearance of infinitely many new conservation laws<sup>1</sup>. Two particles whose total “momentum” is zero would in general never scatter into a final state with the same “momentum” and the same quantum numbers under the lattice internal symmetries, because in general the initial and final states would have different lattice momenta. Moreover, the number of superselection rules not explained by the lattice internal symmetries and conservation of this “momentum” would be infinite.

We now collect all our intermediate results together in the following theorem.

---

<sup>1</sup> This observation is due to A. Casher.

*Theorem.* Consider a hamiltonian defined on a regular lattice. Assume the existence of a compact global symmetry group which is not spontaneously broken. Assume also that the continuum limit is relativistic and that the only massless particles are fermions. Under these assumptions, there is an equal number of left handed and right handed fermions in every complex representation of the global symmetry group, provided  $R(\mathbf{x}, t)$  is local and  $\mathcal{R}^{-1}(\mathbf{p})$  is bounded for every admissible set of interpolating fields.

*Proof.* Consider all sets of interpolating fields which satisfy the above assumptions and which belong to a given complex representation. Choose a maximal set. By this we mean that the total number of  $Z$ -s, as determined by the limiting procedure (13) and summed over all primary singularity points, is maximal. This number is then the total number of massless fermions in that representation.

Locality of  $R(\mathbf{x}, t)$  and boundedness of  $\mathcal{R}^{-1}(\mathbf{p})$  imply that  $\mathcal{R}^{-1}(\mathbf{p})$  is analytic except at generalized degeneracy points. Furthermore, the allowed forms of singularities, eqs. (12) and (14), imply that  $\mathcal{R}^{-1}(\mathbf{p})$  has a continuous first derivative at the generalized degeneracy points, and that all zeros of  $\mathcal{R}^{-1}(\mathbf{p})$  (which occur at primary singularity points) are of the relativistic form (2). In addition,  $\mathcal{R}^{-1}(\mathbf{p})$  is hermitian. Hence  $\mathcal{R}^{-1}(\mathbf{p})$  satisfies all the assumptions of the NN theorem. Applying the theorem, we conclude that  $\mathcal{R}^{-1}(\mathbf{p})$  has an equal number of left handed and right handed zeros. Since the set of interpolating field we have chosen is maximal, this implies that the spectrum contains an equal number of left handed and right handed fermions in the given complex representation.

For completeness, we recall why the assumption that a fermion belongs to a complex representation is needed in the NN theorem. If a fermion belongs to a real representation, it is possible to use real field (Majorana) formulation. A single Majorana fermion can then generate both a left handed and a right handed pole in its two point function. This is the only way to violate the one-to-one correspondence between poles of the two point function and massless fermions. Of course, this exceptional situation is of no help if we are trying to construct chiral fermions.

#### 4. The most general case

We now turn to discuss the most general case. In this section we will prove that the spectrum is vector-like provided  $R(\mathbf{x}, t)$  is weakly local of degree  $\gamma > 4$ , and all other assumptions are the same as in sect. 3. (For simplicity we continue to work in four dimensions). We believe that this condition is not only sufficient, but actually

necessary. However, we have not attempted to construct explicit models that will assess this conjecture.

In complete analogy to the first part of the lemma of sect. 2, one can show that if  $R(\mathbf{x}, t)$  is weakly local of degree  $\gamma > 3$  than  $\hat{R}_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{p}, t)$  is continuous. Moreover, since taking the  $n$ -th  $\mathbf{p}$ -derivative amounts to multiplication by  $\mathbf{x}^n$  in configuration space,  $\hat{R}_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{p}, t)$  will have continuous  $n$ -th derivatives with respect to  $\mathbf{p}$  provided  $R(\mathbf{x}, t)$  is weakly local of degree  $\gamma > 3 + n$ . Since we need a continuous first derivative, we assume that  $R(\mathbf{x}, t)$  is weakly local of degree  $\gamma > 4$ .

What is left for us to do is to prove that, if  $\hat{R}_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{p}, t)$  has continuous  $n$ -th derivatives with respect to  $\mathbf{p}$ , then the same is true for  $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p})$  except at generalized degeneracy points. The assumed form of the low energy effective lagrangian is the same as before, and so from this point on we can simply repeat the discussion of sect. 3.

In order to relate the differential properties of  $\hat{R}_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{p}, t)$  and  $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p})$  we introduce the spectral representation

$$\tilde{R}_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{p}, \omega) = \int_0^\infty dE \left\{ \frac{\rho_{\alpha\beta}^{(1)}(\mathbf{p}, E)}{E - \omega} - \frac{\rho_{\alpha\beta}^{(2)}(\mathbf{p}, E)}{E + \omega} \right\}. \quad (15)$$

In eq. (15)  $E$  and  $\mathbf{p}$  are real, whereas  $\omega$  is complex with  $\text{Im } \omega > 0$ . As before, we are interested in the limit  $\text{Im } \omega \rightarrow 0$ . The spectral functions are given by

$$\rho_{\alpha\beta}^{(1)}(\mathbf{p}, E) = \int_n \delta(E - E_n) \delta^3(\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{p}_n) \langle 0 | \psi_\alpha(\mathbf{0}, 0) | n \rangle \langle n | \psi_\beta^\dagger(\mathbf{0}, 0) | 0 \rangle, \quad (16)$$

and  $\rho_{\alpha\beta}^{(2)}(\mathbf{p}, E)$  is obtained by interchanging  $\psi_\alpha$  and  $\psi_\beta^\dagger$  and replacing  $\delta^3(\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{p}_n)$  by  $\delta^3(\mathbf{p} + \mathbf{p}_n)$ . In eq. (16)  $\int_n$  stands for a sum over all intermediate states. One can relate the two spectral functions by invoking  $\mathcal{PCT}$  invariance, but we will not need this relation below.

We will first prove the continuity of  $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p})$  away from generalized degeneracy points. Let us denote

$$\Omega_{\alpha\beta}^{(i)}(\mathbf{p}) = \int_0^\infty dE \rho_{\alpha\beta}^{(i)}(\mathbf{p}, E), \quad i = 1, 2. \quad (17)$$

We want to prove the existence of a uniform bound

$$|\Omega_{\alpha\beta}^{(i)}(\mathbf{p})| < b_3, \quad (18)$$

for some  $0 < b_3 < \infty$ . Once this bound is established we are done. While we know very little on  $E_0(\mathbf{p})$  for general values of  $\mathbf{p}$ , our assumption that low energy physics is relativistic implies in particular that  $E_0(\mathbf{p})$  is continuous provided its value is less than some physical scale  $E_1 > 0$ . Therefore, for every  $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{D}$ , where  $\mathcal{D}$  is a small enough neighbourhood of  $\mathbf{p}_0 \in \mathcal{B}$ , one has

$$E_m(\mathbf{p}_0) \leq E_0(\mathbf{p}), \quad (19)$$

$$E_m(\mathbf{p}_0) = \min\{\frac{1}{2}E_0(\mathbf{p}_0), E_1\}. \quad (20)$$

Like  $E_0(\mathbf{p}_0)$ , one has  $E_m(\mathbf{p}_0) = 0$  if and only if  $\mathbf{p}_0$  is a generalized degeneracy point. Assuming that  $\mathbf{p}_0$  is *not* a generalized degeneracy point, it is now straightforward to establish the following uniform bound for every  $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{D}$

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{R}_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{p}, i\epsilon) - \tilde{R}_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{p}, i\epsilon')| &\leq \\ &\leq \int_{E_0(\mathbf{p})}^{\infty} dE \left( |\rho_{\alpha\beta}^{(1)}(\mathbf{p}, E)| + |\rho_{\alpha\beta}^{(2)}(\mathbf{p}, E)| \right) \frac{|\epsilon - \epsilon'|}{E_0^2(\mathbf{p})} \\ &\leq \frac{2b_3}{E_m^2(\mathbf{p}_0)} |\epsilon - \epsilon'|. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Eq. (21) implies that  $\mathcal{R}_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{p})$  is continuous except at generalized degeneracy points.

It remains to establish the bound (18). Since the condition of weak locality holds for every  $t$ , it follows that the magnitude of long range couplings in the hamiltonian should obey the same bound (9a) as  $R_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ , where we now set  $t = 0$ . In quantum mechanics, time derivatives are given by multi-commutators with the hamiltonian, and so the  $n$ -th time derivative of  $R_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{x}, t)$  obeys the same bound at large space-like separations as  $R_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{x}, t)$  itself. For the case at hand,  $\gamma > 3$ , the  $\mathbf{x}$ -summation converges uniformly for every  $n$ , and so  $\hat{R}_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{p}, t)$  has continuous time derivatives of every order.

The spectral representation for the  $n$ -th time derivative is

$$\left( i \frac{d}{dt} \right)^{(n)} \hat{R}_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{p}, t) \Big|_{t=0} = \int_0^{\infty} dE E^n \left\{ \rho_{\alpha\beta}^{(1)}(\mathbf{p}, E) + (-)^n \rho_{\alpha\beta}^{(2)}(\mathbf{p}, E) \right\}. \quad (22)$$

Convergence of the integral on the r.h.s. of eq. (22) for even  $n$  implies that  $|\rho_{\alpha\beta}^{(1)}(\mathbf{p}, E) + \rho_{\alpha\beta}^{(2)}(\mathbf{p}, E)|$  decreases faster than any power of  $E$  for  $E \rightarrow \infty$ . Convergence of the integral for odd  $n$  implies the same for the difference of the spectral functions. Hence each of the spectral functions separately decreases faster than any power. Together with continuity of  $\hat{R}_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{p}, t)$  as a function of  $\mathbf{p}$ , this implies that  $\Omega_{\alpha\beta}^{(i)}(\mathbf{p})$  as defined in eq. (17) is continuous. Compactness of the Brillouin zone then implies the existence of the uniform bound (18). This concludes the proof that  $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p})$  is continuous except at generalized degeneracy points.

The proof that the derivative of  $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p})$  is continuous except at generalized degeneracy points is completely analogous. We simply replace every function of  $\mathbf{p}$  by its  $\mathbf{p}$ -derivative in eqs. (15-22). In general, this process can continue up to the  $n$ -th  $\mathbf{p}$ -derivative, provided  $R_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{x}, t)$  is weakly local of degree  $\gamma > 3 + n$ .

In conclusion, we showed that if  $R_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{x}, t)$  is weakly local of degree  $\gamma > 4$  then  $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p})$  has a continuous first derivative except at generalized degeneracy points. From



here on one can repeat the discussion of sect. 3 and prove that the spectrum is necessarily vector-like.

## 5. Discussion

The main lesson of our no-go theorem is that, as far as fermion doubling is concerned, there is essentially no difference between free and interacting lattice theories. From the correlation functions of the interacting theory one can always construct an object which plays the role of an effective quadratic hamiltonian for the massless fermions. The types of singularities in the dispersion relation which allow one to escape the conclusions of the no-go theorem are the same as in the free case. Thus, the only remaining question is whether such “bad” singularities can be less dangerous if they occur in an interacting theory. In this paper we have gone a long way towards giving a rigorous, negative answer to this question. For example, we can reject without relying on perturbation theory [18] any lattice model whose dispersion relation for the effective low energy degrees of freedom contains a discontinuity, on the grounds that such a theory must be a-causal.

Our no-go theorem is sufficiently strong to exclude the existence of chiral fermions in all the fermion-scalar models proposed for that purpose in the literature [9]. This is no surprise, as all explicit model calculations [11] have consistently reached the same conclusion. The virtue of our approach is that it provides a uniform basis for treating all these models, and that it constraints the spectrum by invoking only physical properties which characterizes a consistent continuum limit.

As we have already mentioned in the introduction, perhaps the most striking consequence of our theorem is the constraints it puts on any attempt to reproduce the standard model on the lattice without violating gauge invariance. It asserts that any such attempt must fail, if the spectrum can be correctly determined by switching off the Electro-Weak interactions (there is no need to switch off QCD), and provided that the effective vertex functions of the Electro-Weak currents are pole-free in the symmetric phase.

One may question the relevance of this conclusion on the grounds that we are not dealing directly with *gauged* Electro-Weak interactions. But when one says that the a gauge theory is chiral, one is making a statement on its elementary, gauge variant fields! These cannot be related directly to physical observables without invoking additional assumptions such as complementarity. Thus, the very *definition* of a chiral gauge theory implicitly assumes that we can determine the elementary fermions’ content by setting the gauge coupling to zero.

Moreover, the widely accepted view that QCD, as defined on the lattice, is a consistent quantum theory with a non-trivial continuum limit, is based on asymptotic freedom and the validity of weak coupling perturbation theory at short distances. Thus, in our opinion, one cannot reject our conclusions without, at the same time, questioning the validity of the present understanding of non-abelian gauge theories.

From a conceptual point of view, this situation is very intriguing, for Electro-Weak phenomenology has been found to be in remarkable agreement with the predictions of continuum perturbation theory, and the lattice has been introduced mainly to allow for a quantitative treatment of the strong interactions. Here we are faced with an inability to provide a uniform, consistent treatment to all the interactions of the standard model simultaneously.

Paradoxically, the only approach to putting the weak interactions on the lattice which still seems viable is based on using gauge non-invariant actions. Several such proposals exist in the literature [19]. We include among them the Rome approach [20], because one cannot derive the gauge fixed action of this approach from a gauge invariant lattice action. It has also been claimed [21] that the recently proposed domain wall fermions do not give rise to a chiral spectrum unless one gives up tree level gauge invariance.

So far, there are only partial results concerning these models, and all of them are in the context of perturbation theory. At this level, it is not unreasonable to expect that gauge invariance will be recovered in the continuum limit, provided the spectrum is anomaly free. In this respect the lattice is not very different from continuum field theories, where no gauge invariant regularization for chiral theories is known to exist. Nevertheless, the Adler-Bardeen theorem [22] guarantees the consistency of perturbation theory provided the theory is anomaly free at the one loop level. In modern language, the Adler-Bardeen theorem can be derived using renormalization group arguments [23]. The renormalization group exists on the lattice as well, and so it is not unreasonable to expect that some version of the Adler-Bardeen theorem should hold on the lattice.

The real unknown is the behaviour of such models at the non-perturbative level. By the no-go theorems, gauge invariance on the lattice implies a vector-like spectrum if we demand that the continuum limit be free of inconsistencies such as violations of causality or Lorentz invariance. Thus, one can suspect that models with explicitly broken gauge symmetries will reveal some unexpected features at the non-perturbative level. Until a detailed understanding of non-perturbative effects in such models is reached, their consistency as well as their relevance to the real world remain unclear.

## Acknowledgements

I thank A. Casher for numerous discussions of the subject. This research was supported in part by the Basic Research Foundation administered by the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, and by a grant from the United States – Israel Binational Science Foundation.

## Appendix A

In this appendix we give two examples of anti-commutator functions in free fermionic hamiltonians in one space dimension. The retarded anti-commutator is obtained by simply multiplying the ordinary anti-commutator by  $\theta(t)$ .

Let us define

$$\Delta_F(x, t) = \langle 0 | \{ \psi(x, t), \psi^\dagger(0, 0) \} | 0 \rangle. \quad (A.1)$$

Here  $\psi(x, t)$  is a single component fermion field. In this appendix and the next one we set  $a = 1$ , and the space coordinate  $x$  takes integer values.  $\Delta_F(x, t)$  satisfies the homogeneous wave equation

$$(\partial_t - \nabla) \Delta_F(x, t) = 0, \quad (A.2)$$

where  $\nabla$  is a lattice difference operator, and the boundary condition  $\Delta_F(x, 0) = \delta_{x,0}$ . It is convenient to express  $\Delta_F(x, t)$  as

$$\Delta_F(x, t) = -i(\partial_t + \nabla) \Delta(x, t), \quad (A.3)$$

where  $\Delta(x, t)$  is a homogeneous solution of the second order equation

$$(\partial_t^2 - \nabla^2) \Delta(x, t) = 0, \quad (A.4)$$

with the boundary conditions  $\Delta(x, 0) = 0$  and  $\partial_t \Delta(x, 0) = i\delta_{x,0}$ . An explicit representation for  $\Delta(x, t)$  is

$$\Delta(x, t) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int d\omega \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} dp e^{i\omega t - ipx} \delta(\omega^2 - E^2(p)) \epsilon(\omega) \quad (A.5a)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{dp}{2|E(p)|} \left( e^{i|E(p)|t - ipx} - e^{-i|E(p)|t - ipx} \right). \quad (A.5b)$$

Here  $E(p)$  is the dispersion relation as determined by the free hamiltonian.

Consider first a nearest neighbour hamiltonian. The lattice difference operator is  $\nabla = \frac{1}{2}(\delta_{x,x'+1} - \delta_{x,x'-1})$ , and the dispersion relation is  $E(p) = \sin p$ . It is convenient to calculate  $\partial_t \Delta(x, t)$  first. A straightforward calculation gives rise to

$$\partial_t \Delta(x, t) = \begin{cases} 0, & x = 2n + 1 \\ iJ_{|x|}(t), & x = 2n. \end{cases} \quad (A.6)$$

Using eq. (A.3) and the boundary conditions satisfied by  $\Delta(x, t)$  we obtain

$$\Delta_F(x, t) = \begin{cases} J_{|x|}(t), & x \geq 0, \\ (-)^x J_{|x|}(t), & x \leq 0. \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.7})$$

This result clearly exhibits the presence of a primary right mover and a doubler which is a left mover. We can estimate  $\Delta_F(x, t)$  using the asymptotic expansion for Bessel functions where both the order  $|x|$  and the argument  $t$  are large. Denote  $\xi = (|x| - t)/t$ . Assuming  $\xi \ll 1$  and  $t\xi \gg 1$  one has

$$J_{|x|}(t) \approx \begin{cases} \frac{\exp(-t\sqrt{2\xi^3})}{t\sqrt{2\xi}}, & \xi > 0, \\ \frac{\cos(t\sqrt{-2\xi^3})}{t\sqrt{-2\xi}}, & \xi < 0. \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.8})$$

The slow decay of  $\Delta_F(x, t)$  *inside* the light cone signals the presence the the high energy excitations with group velocity which is smaller than one. Outside the light cone,  $\Delta_F(x, t)$  decreases faster than an exponential.

We now perform a similar calculation for the SLAC derivative. The dispersion relation is  $E(p) = p$ . We now have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_F(x, t) &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int d\omega \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} dp (\omega + p) e^{i\omega t - ipx} \delta(\omega^2 - E^2(p)) \epsilon(\omega) \\ &= \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{\sin(\pi(x - t))}{x - t}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.9})$$

Thus, although  $\Delta(x, t)$  is maximal on the classical trajectory  $x = t$ , it decays extremely slowly for both  $|x| < t$  and  $|x| > t$ . The non-local character of the anti-commutator is necessary in order to produce the expected discontinuity in  $\mathcal{R}(p)$ .

## Appendix B

An unwise choice of interpolating fields may give rise to two types of spurious, kinematical singularities in  $\mathcal{R}^{-1}(\mathbf{p})$ . This can best be illustrated through an example in the context of a free fermion theory. Consider again a single component field in one space dimension with a standard nearest neighbour hamiltonian. The spectrum consists of a right mover at  $p = 0$ , and a left mover at  $p = \pi$ . In self-explanatory notation, the retarded anti-commutator is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}(p) &= \langle \psi \psi^\dagger \rangle(p) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sin p}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.1})$$

Suppose that, instead of using  $\psi(x)$  as a single interpolating field for both fermions, we unwisely decide to use the two fields  $\psi_{\pm}(x) = \pm \frac{1}{2}(\psi(x+1) + \psi(x-1) \pm 2\psi(x))$ . In Fourier space this becomes  $\psi_{\pm}(p) = (1 \pm \cos p)\psi(p)$ . The  $\pm$  is now considered as a “flavour” index, and

$$R'(x, t) = \begin{pmatrix} \langle \psi_+ \psi_+^\dagger \rangle & \langle \psi_+ \psi_-^\dagger \rangle \\ \langle \psi_- \psi_+^\dagger \rangle & \langle \psi_- \psi_-^\dagger \rangle \end{pmatrix}. \quad (B.2)$$

In Fourier space this becomes

$$\mathcal{R}'(p) = \begin{pmatrix} (1 + \cos p)^2 & \sin^2 p \\ \sin^2 p & (1 - \cos p)^2 \end{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sin p}. \quad (B.3)$$

Notice that  $\frac{1}{\sin p}$  is nothing but  $\mathcal{R}(p)$ . We now observe that  $\det \mathcal{R}'(p) = 0$  identically. This is a consequence of the fact the the two fields  $\psi_{\pm}(x)$  are *linearly dependent in the Hilbert space*. By this we mean that their matrix elements between any two states of momentum  $k$  and  $k + p$  are linearly dependent for fixed  $p$ . In the above example, the proportionality constant is the kinematical factor  $(1 + \cos p)/(1 - \cos p)$ .

The solution to this problem is simple. In the above example, we have to replace the two fields  $\psi_{\pm}(x)$  by a linear combination of them  $a\psi_+(x) + b\psi_-(x)$ . In so doing, there are some constraints on the coefficients  $a$  and  $b$  which are necessary in order to prevent the appearance of spurious poles in  $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{p})$ .

Clearly, such a pole will appear if one of the coefficients is zero. In this case we are interpolating only one of the fermions, and a *zero in the propagator* will appear at the location of the missing fermion. Another possibility is that we take both  $a$  and  $b$  to be non-zero, but with opposite signs. What is common to both is the existence of a point where the linear combination  $a(1 + \cos p) + b(1 - \cos p)$  vanishes. On the other hand, any choice of  $a$  and  $b$  where both are, say, strictly positive, is admissible. In this case the kinematical factor never vanishes and both fermions are interpolated. Notice that the choice  $a = b = 1/2$  brings us back to the original field  $\psi(x)$ .

Of course, similar phenomena can arise from a bad choice of interpolating fields in an interacting theory as well. What we need is a procedure that will allow us eliminate all kinematical singularities. Since we have no knowledge on the way a given set of interpolating fields was constructed, we are lead to the following two step procedure.

In the first step we *on purpose* multiply the interpolating fields by various kinematical factors. If necessary, we enlarged the set by additional fields that are linearly dependent in the Hilbert space on existing ones. The aim at this stage is to achieve a one-to-one correspondence between fields and fermions.

In the second stage we minimize the total number of interpolating fields by taking appropriate linear combinations of the previous, linearly dependent fields. Suppose that there are  $n$  primary singularities, and  $k_n$  fermions are interpolated at the  $n$ -th primary singularity. We can then replace the fields which interpolate the first fermion at every point by a single linear combination. This single field will interpolate the first fermion at every primary singularity.

If we continue this process, we are guaranteed that the final set will be independent in the Hilbert space. However, without additional information, we do not know whether in every step it will be possible to avoid the appearance of zeros in the propagator. If no choice of interpolating field can be made which is free of such zeros, then these zeros are genuine, and the pole in the inverse propagator is not a kinematical singularity. As we have discussed in the introduction, we expect that theories with this property must be inconsistent.

Finally, we comment that the complicated process described above was necessary only because we assumed that we know nothing about the hamiltonian of the theory, nor on the way the interpolating fields are constructed from the elementary fields of the theory. In practise, one has a specific model in mind, and it is easy to identify reasonable candidate interpolating fields as well as to verify that no kinematical singularities are present.

- 
- [ 1 ] K.G. Wilson, in *New Phenomena in Sub-Nuclear Physics* (Erice, 1975), ed. A. Zichichi (Plenum, New York, 1977).
  - [ 2 ] J. Smit, unpublished.
  - [ 3 ] L.H. Karsten and J. Smit, Nucl. Phys. **B183** (1981) 103.
  - [ 4 ] H.B. Nielsen and M. Ninomiya, Nucl. Phys. **B185** (1981) 20, *Errata* Nucl. Phys. **B195** (1982) 541; Nucl. Phys. **B193** (1981) 173.
  - [ 5 ] S.D. Drell, M. Weinstein and S. Yankielowicz, Phys. Rev. **D14** (1976) 487, 1627.
  - [ 6 ] C. Rebbi, Phys. Lett. **B186** (1987) 200.
  - [ 7 ] L.H. Karsten and J. Smit, Nucl. Phys. **B144** (1978) 536; Phys. Lett. **B85** (1979) 100.

- [ 8 ] M. Campostrini, G. Curci and A. Pelissetto, Phys. Lett. **B193** (1987) 279.  
A. Pelissetto, Ann. Phys. **182** (1988) 177.
- [ 9 ] J. Smit, Acta. Phys. Pol. **B17** (1986) 531. P. Swift, Phys. Lett. **B145** (1984) 256. E. Eichten and J. Preskill, Nucl. Phys. **B268** (1986) 179. I. Montvay, Phys. Lett. **B199** (1987) 89; Nucl. Phys. (Proc. Suppl.) **B4** (1988) 443.
- [ 10 ] I. Montvay, in *Lattice 91*, Nucl. Phys. (Proc. Suppl.) **B26** (1992) 57. J. Smit, Nucl. Phys. (Proc. Suppl.) **B17** (1990) 3.
- [ 11 ] M.F.L. Golterman, D.N. Petcher and J. Smit, Nucl. Phys. **B370** (1992) 51.  
M.F.L. Golterman and D.N. Petcher, Nucl. Phys. (Proc. Suppl.) **B26** (1992) 483. W. Bock, A.K. De, C. Frick, K. Jansen and T. Trappenberg, Nucl. Phys. **B371** (1992) 683. M.F.L. Golterman and D.N. Petcher Nucl. Phys. (Proc. Suppl.) **B26** (1992) 486. M.F.L. Golterman, D.N. Petcher and E. Rivas, Wash. U. preprint HEP/92-80, Nucl. Phys. **B** to appear.
- [ 12 ] D.B. Kaplan, Phys. Lett. **B288** (1992) 342; Nucl. Phys. (Proc. Suppl.) **B30** (1993) 597.
- [ 13 ] Y. Shamir, Weizmann preprint WIS-93/56-JUNE-PH, hep-lat/9306023, submitted to Phys. Rev. Lett.
- [ 14 ] T. Banks and A. Dabholkar, Phys. Rev. **D46** (1992) 4016.
- [ 15 ] N. N. Bogoliubov and D. V. Shirkov, *Introduction to the Theory of Quantized Fields*, Interscience Publ. New York, 1959, p. 654. H. J. Bremermann, R. Oehme and J. G. Taylor, Phys. Rev. **109** (1958) 2178.
- [ 16 ] S.G. Krantz, *Function theory of Several Complex Variables*, John Wiley, New York, 1982, p. 133.
- [ 17 ] Y. Shamir, in preparation.
- [ 18 ] J.M. Rabin, Phys. Rev. **D24** (1981) 3218.
- [ 19 ] J. L. Alonso, Ph. Boucaud, J. L. Cortes and E. Rivas, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A 5** (1990) 275, Nucl. Phys. (Proc. Suppl.) **B17** (1990) 461. I-H. Lee, Nucl. Phys. (Proc. Suppl.) **B17** (1990) 457. S. A. Frolov and A. A. Slavnov, preprint MPI-Ph 93-12. W. Bock, J. Smit and J. C. Vink, preprint ITFA 93-13, hep-lat 9306012.

- [ 20 ] A. Borelli, L. Maiani, G.-C. Rossi, R. Sisto and M. Testa, Nucl. Phys. **B333** (1990) 335.
- [ 21 ] Y. Shamir, Weizmann preprint WIS-93/20/FEB-PH, to appear in Nucl. Phys. **B**.
- [ 22 ] L.S. Adler W. Bardeen, Phys. Rev. **182** (1969) 1517
- [ 23 ] A. Zee, Phys. Rev. Lett. **29** (1972) 1198